APPEAL INSTITUTE ISSUE

SOCIALIST APPEAL

An Organ of Revolutionary Socialism

Published Monthly by Socialist Appeal, Room 719—35 S. Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill. Subscription: One dollar for 24 issues

Vol. III.—No. 3 MARCH, 1937 Price 5 Cents

CONTENTS

Editorial: *The Crisis in the Party*..... 29
Albert Goldman: *The Appeal Institute* 36
Ernest Erber: *Statement* 39
Appeal Institute Resolutions
Internal Situation 40
Trade Union 40
Labor Party 42

The Crisis in the Party

DURING the past month it has become clear to every alert party member that our party is in the midst of a serious crisis. It would be a mistake, however, to imagine that the existence of more or less organized "factions" or "groups" is the mark of the crisis. On the contrary, groups and factions are entirely normal and healthy in the life of an active and democratic political organization. It is through such groups, functioning within the disciplined framework of the party as a whole that differing ideas and methods are presented for discussion and decision to the party membership. Though internal groups may and should disappear temporarily from time to time, on the rare occasions when there is no important divergence on political issues among the membership—indeed, a group which is not built on a specific political platform is of necessity an unprincipled organizational clique—nevertheless the long continued absence of groups is a sure proof not of united vigor, but of sterility and political death. This is precisely the meaning of the complete absence of internal groupings in the parties of the Communist International. They are absent in the C.I. because critical thought is prohibited. Differences of opinion are settled not by democratic discussion, but by expulsion—or, in the Soviet Union itself, by the still more direct methods of the G.P.U.

The existence of groups in our party, then, is not what indicates the crisis. What shows that there is a crisis is, rather, the fact that certain groups and individuals in the party call for the **splitting** of the party, call for the **expulsion,** not merely for the **political defeat,** of the group or groups to which they are opposed. It is essential that the party membership understand the exact political nature of the crisis, so that it may act on the basis of such understanding, and not through either ignorance or prejudice.

The present crisis, as the APPEAL has already made clear, is not something altogether new and unexpected. It is, in reality, simply one stage further in the process of development which began nearly four years ago, and which has twice before reached the level of crisis: once in connection with the "Declaration of Principles"; again at the Cleveland Convention. The actions taken at Cleveland, the split with the main forces of the Old Guard, in New York, Pennsylvania and Connecticut, though representing a progressive answer to the immediate issue then so sharply posed, were yet insufficient to solve the fundamental problem. For this reason, the subsequent sharpening of new conflicts, the breaking out of a new crisis, could not have been avoided, no matter what efforts were made at postponement. The calling of the Special Convention precipitated the new crisis at the new stage of the development of the party as a whole. This result necessarily followed from the calling of the Special Convention precisely because the fundamental problem is not yet solved. And until it is solved, in one of the only two possible ways, new crises, in varying degrees of intensity, will periodically arise.

What, then, is the fundamental problem? The APPEAL has repeatedly stated it; it is neither complex nor mysterious. It is simply this: will the party continue forward on the road through which it will become the revolutionary party of the American working class? or will it slip back into reformism and disintegration? Since 1933 this has been the basic problem underlying every other issue in the party, and every organizational struggle; and it will continue to dominate the party until it is finally settled, one way or the other. For it is not yet settled. Even the split with the main forces of the Old Guard did not settle it, as the present situation in the party makes sufficiently obvious.

Since Cleveland the problem has, in some measure at least, been fitted into a new setting. This is due to the extraordinary rapidity of social and political changes, both nationally and internationally. To mention but a few of the more important: The new imperialist war has moved appreciably nearer, and throughout the world all political policies are dominated by preparations for the war. The social conflict in Spain reached the climax of open civil war. The General Strike in France showed that the French proletariat is on the eve of decisive struggles. The Soviet bureaucracy, seeing the approach of the war, finds it necessary to advance its new policy with multiplied speed and ruthlessness, as shown above all by the Moscow Trials. In this country the C.I.O. movement and the wave of strikes show in their own way the deep repercussions of the growing international clash of forces. All of these great events, directly or indirectly, consciously or unconsciously, leave their impress on our party, and help to determine the present program and relationships of groups and individuals.

The Attack of the Communist Party

For a considerable time following the adoption of the new People's Front orientation by the Communist International, the chief object of the Communist party in this country with reference to the Socialist party was to obliterate the memories of the "Third Period" and of the Madison Square Garden episode. The violent abuse of the Third Period changed to kindliness. Social-fascists became the best of comrades. The united front and then the People's Front became the order of the day. But an unfortunate conflict arose, and Browder was placed in the most perplexing dilemma faced by any of the little leaders of the Third International. The new line of the C.I. with respect to the parties of the Second International was predicated on the assumption that these parties were reformist, social-democratic, in policy; and indeed flowed from the fact that the C.I. itself had taken over a reformist policy. But in this country the Stalinists discovered that the Socialist party was rapidly leaving reformism and social-democracy behind; so determinedly, in fact, that in the Spring of 1936 it split with the spearhead of reformism and recruited into its own ranks the revolutionists from the former Workers' party. Here was a formidable obstacle indeed: The plan of the C.I. to enlist the masses of the democratic countries for the coming war dictated joining with the reformist parties of the Second International in anti-revolutionary Popular Fronts which would simultaneously make ready a mass recruiting base for the war and wipe out any independent revolutionary political organization. But the Socialist party of the U. S., though still formally a member of the Second International, was proving a recalcitrant mistress. Instead of leaping happily into the arms of her Peoples Front lover, she was turning in the opposite direction, toward direct struggle against capitalism—even, unfortunately for Browder, against democratic capitalism— and against the approaching war. She carried through her divorce action against Waldman, and then—horror of horrors—instead of knocking at Browder's door on 13th Street, she was discovered consorting with "the vanguard of the bourgeoisie, the counter-revolutionary assassins," in short, the Trotskyites.

Stalinists "Help" Us

The blows fell on Browder. And to cap them off, the Socialist party insisted, insisted against the very best and most sympathetic advice of the Ninth Convention of the Communist party, on conducting an independent working-class campaign in the 1936 Elections. This was too much. And from then on the Stalinists have carried on against the erring Socialist friends a campaign whose intensity and viciousness is unparalleled in the history of the labor movement in this country—all, of course, as the recent "Appeal to Socialists," published by the Stalinists, points out, in the most friendly spirit "of comradely assistance," all of course "to help you in the task of saving and building your party."

Consider the election campaign. What did the Stalinists say to us? They said that we were the tools of the Landon-Liberty League-Hearst combination. They said quite flatly that Norman Thomas was the stooge of Hearst and Landon. They said that we were destroying working class unity and directly aiding fascism and reaction because we pointed out that Roosevelt also was an agent of the bourgeoisie. The main fire of their attack, identical with the attack of the Social-Democratic Federation (because proceeding from an identical political line), during the entire campaign was directed against us. Every vote they gave to Roosevelt, master-strategist of American imperialism, was a blow against reaction (Browder boasted about it in his post-election report); every vote they took away from us was a victory for progress.

It has been the same with every issue which has arisen during the months since Cleveland. When we point out that the issue in Spain is socialism vs. capitalism, that the workers of Spain cannot win in the end by confining their struggle to the preservation of capitalist edmocracy, then we are, say the Stalinists, allies of Franco. When Norman Thomas and Devere Allen join a Committee to defend the right of asylum and of a fair hearing, so fatefully threatened by the Moscow Trials and the lynch campaign against Trotsky, they have become tools of assassins. When the CALL calls for no support of the U.S. government in any war, Browder, in his Madison Square Garden speech, carefully suggests that it is preparing to sell out the United States to Japan. When our comrades call for a class-struggle policy in the Workers' Alliance and an end with behind-the-back deals with supervisors and purely parliamentary slogans, they have become disrupters of the unity of the unemployed. When our party demands as an international perspective a break with the class collaborationism of the People's Front and an advance along the road of revolutionary struggle for socialism, we have gone over into the fascist camp and have joined the enemies of the Soviet Union. And in recent weeks, in California, Newark, New York City, Boston, our comrades distributing leaflets and literature, are set upon physically by Stalinist hoodlums.

Stalinist Cure for S. P.

But the efforts of the Stalinists are not by any means confined to mere pedagogy. They propose to do more than to teach us little lessons in Marxism-Stalinism. Browder is a practical man as well as the teacher of the American proletariat. He intervenes more directly and with more specific proposals. During recent months especially the mimeograph machine and printing presses of the Stalinists have devoted a flattering amount of attention to material specifically designed for Socialist party members. Scarcely a meeting goes by that we don't have placed in our hands a lengthy document explaining just what is wrong with us and just what we should do to cure it (as Amter gracefully puts it: "You are the patients. You must also be the doctor. We Communists can only assist you.") The trouble with the Socialist party, as summed up by the Stalinist diagonsticians, is: You have swallowed the Trotskyist poison. The prescribed cure is, simply: You must vomit forth this poison. A leaflet recently distributed by the Chicago Y.C.L. to "All Sincere Young Socialists," puts it in capital letters: "THE RIDDING OF YOUR RANKS OF THIS POISON IS TASK NO. 1 FOR SINCERE YOUNG SOCIALISTS!"

There is nothing accidental in the appearance of these documents. Already last June, at the Ninth Convention of the C.P., the Socialist party was told "if you swallow poison, be sure to have a glass of emetic on hand and drink it quickly." The approach of the Special Convention poses the question more sharply. As already commented on in the APPEAL, Browder posed the central task of the coming months in his December 4th report to the Central Committee. It is advisable to quote again from this report the lines which have given the leading directive for Stalinist activity since that time: "The Socialists must understand that nothing of a constructive nature can come out of the Socialist party except on the basis of struggle against the counter-revolutionary Trotskyite poison. The Socialist party must rid itself of its poisonous influence . . . " Then, more concretely: "The

only way to rid the Socialist party of Trotskyite influence is by concentrating the struggle for the expulsion of the Trotskyites against their most apparently harmful manifestations. The Socialist party has called a special convention for the next March, as you know. We must consult with the best elements in the Socialist party about their problems in the most helpful way . . . They must prepare for the March convention of the Socialist party to get results, to win the Socialist party for the united front and make a clean break with counter-revolutionary Trotskyites."

Here, then, announced openly by the chief spokesman of the Communist party, is the proposal of the Stalinists for the solution of the present crisis in our party. It is summed up in the central slogan: Expel the Trotskyites!

As the Convention draws nearer, the activity of the Stalinists redoubles. One of its latest, and most extraordinary, manifestations is a 16 page brochure, handsomely printed, entitled "Appeal to Socialists," and obligingly distributed to all Socialist party members free of charge. Every party member should, we urge, take advantage of this generosity; it is a document to read and to ponder.

"Through this bulletin," the "Appeal to Socialists" begins in a thoroughly comradely fashion, "we wish to participate in your pre-convention discussion." The Stalinist conclusion will not come as a surprise. If the Socialist party is to be saved, "it can only be done by the convention definitely deciding to break with all Trotskyite and semi-Trotskyite policies, and the complete elimination of the Trotskyites from the Socialist party."

2

To understand fully the exact meaning of the Stalinist attack, it is necessary to answer carefully two questions: (1) Just what are the "Trotskyite and semi-Trotskyite policies" with which the party is asked to break? (2) Just who are the "Trotskyites" whom the Stalinists want to have "eliminated"?

(1) The Stalinist literature makes absolutely clear what they mean by the Trotskyism which, like a cancer, is eating out the vitals of the Socialist party. Trotskyist poison, says Browder in his report, leads the Socialist party to come "out in principle against the Peoples Front in America and advocated its liquidation in France and Spain." Further, Trotkyist sectarianism leads to "an unprincipled split with its local organizations, which had somewhat of a mass base in Connecticut and Pennsylvania; it split with the New York Old Guard which had trade union connections." In addition, "Trotskyism" calls "on the Spanish people to abandon their present democratic struggle supposedly for an immediate socialist revolution" (from the Chicago Y.C.L. pamphlet). And Trotskyism calls for no support of any war undertaken by any capitalist government.

The list could be easily multiplied. But the general point is clear: "Trotskyism" means anything, anything whatever, which opposes the present People's Front line of the Comintern, any criticism of the People's Front anywhere, any opposition to Stalinist social-patrotism in favor of the revolutionary struggle against war, any belief that the issue of our epoch is that between socialism and fascism and not between democracy and fascism; in short, "Trotskyism" means any advocacy of the ideas and methods of revolutionary Marxism, as opposed to Stalinist class collaborationism and betrayal; it means any sign of refusal to accept ideological dictation from the C. I., any breath of criticism against the Soviet bureaucracy.

This conclusion is of great significance. Some comrades delude themselves with the notion that the attack of the Stalinists is directed merely against the died-in-the-wool "Fourth Internationalists," against those who base their political position on the complete theory of the "permanent revolution," the complete analysis of the Soviet Union which is associated with this theory, etc. Let them not be deceived. It may be that the Stalinists look upon the Fourth Internationalists in the Socialist party as the chief immediate danger and the most unrelenting advocates of revolutionary as opposed to Stalinist ideas. But their attack is directed against **every** idea and policy which is incompatible with the present line of the C.I., and will continue until every such idea and policy is beaten down—unless, of course, that attack meanwhile is met and defeated.

(2) We are led to a similar conclusion in answer to the question, Who, in the eyes of the Stalinists, are the "Trotskyites"? Does this mean the Socialist party members who were once members of the former Workers party? Once again, do not be deceived. Let us consult the "Appeal to Socialists": "Under the influence of these fascist agents within the working class" the Socialist party "discovered that the line of the Seventh World Congress, the policy of the Peoples Front in the struggle against reaction and fascism was 'opportunistic'." In this respect, then, the entire party is apparently Trotskyite. (It should be kept in mind that this "discovery" was made by the Socialist party some while before the entrance of the Workers' party members.) Let us go on: "The real danger of the Trotskyites to the Socialist party is seen by the extent to which they have corrupted some of the elements of the former 'Left.' They have practically captured the SOCIALIST CALL. They maneuvered and succeeded with those persons who are close to their views ... to take over the SOCIALIST CALL and removed the former editor, Levenstein, who was not satisfactory to the Trotskyites." Now comes a real revelation: "The present staff in the national office is, like THE CALL following a policy very close to the Trotskyites . . ." One entire article is entitled, "The SOCIALIST CALL'S, Trotskyite line." And Norman Thomas' Trotskyite leanings have been a hundred times assailed in the Stalinist press.

Against whom is the Stalinist attack directed? The Stalinists themselves give the answer: against everyone, anyone, who does not accept the Stalinist ideology; that is, against every revolutionary Socialist, every genuine left-winger, every near left-winger, in the Socialist party. And the attack will not rest until every revolutionist, every left-winger, is whipped into line—unless, once more, we stand up like revolutionists and like men, and smash the attack head on.

3.

What is the aim of the Stalinist attack on the party? The whole content of their campaign, as well as the nature of the international line of the C. I., give the answer. The aim is to destroy the Socialist party as an independent political force; to make the Socialist party simply an instrument of Stalinism. And, after all, what other aim could the Stalinists have? To succeed in accomplishing this aim is, in point of fact, a life-and-death matter for Stalinism. The Stalinist preparations for the war cannot be carried through if a strong revolutionary current blocks the social-patriotic path. The war is not far off. Therefore the Stalinists **must** use every device to break up any revolutionary or potentially revolutionary organization in this or any other country before the war begins.

We "exaggerate the danger of the Communist party"? The APPEAL has often been thus criticized. Let the critics consider the fate of the Spanish Socialist Youth. Two years ago they were a powerful organization, moving rapidly in a revolutionary direction, the main hope of the Spanish working class. The Stalinist campaign swung into action. With the help of demagogic—and most friendly—"unity" slogans, they put across a merger be-

tween the Socialist and Stalinist youth into an "independent revolutionary youth organization." Today this organization is an affiliate of the Third International, part and parcel of the Stalinist world machine, committed to the most extreme Popular Frontism, its internal political life strangled, and now in the forefront of those in Spain who are hounding the revolutionists who call for a revolutionary struggle against Franco. In Catalonia the Socialist and Communist parties united, and the subsequent history is identical. Politics, alas, is not a nursery game. There is only one way to make peace with Stalinism: and that is by becoming a Stalinist—though even that, as the Trials show, is often not enough.

The Stalinists propose, as their solution for the party crisis, that the Convention "expel the Trotskyites." Suppose it were true—as we have seen it is not—that they meant merely, expel the former Workers party members. What then? Would the Stalinists then be "satisfied"? They themselves make it plain that they would not be. Then would come the turn of the Call Board, with its policies "taken from Trotskyism"; then of the National Office, with its "strong Trotskyite influence"; then of all the "semi-Trotskyites" that the "Appeal to Socialists" refers to; then of every party member who does not capitulate politically. And each successive amputation would make the next only the easier; the expulsion of the "extreme Trotskyists" would knock away the solid support of the Left Wing, would leave the remaining left wingers a hundred times more helpless.

The political mechanics of the process are unquestionable: The expulsion of any section of the Left Wing will **guarantee** the disintegration of the party as an independent political force. The direction of the development of the past four years would be immediately reversed. The party would head back with lightning speed into reformism and class collaborationism, and collapse with a thud into the arms of the Peoples Front.

The Paul Porter Pamphlet

It is not our intention in this article to analyse at length the attack of the Old Guard reformists on the party. The APPEAL has done this before. And, besides, the Old Guard campaign is identical in political content with the campaign of the Stalinists, from the vicious gibes at the "Thom-Trotskyist" Socialist party, to the central slogan of "Expel the Trotskyists."

The task now is to study the influence of these attacks against the party from the outside on various groups and individuals within the party. Nor is it necessary to speculate whether any given group or individual is to be numbered among those "best elements of the Socialist party" with whom Browder, in his report, promised to "discuss . . . about their problems." That there are direct agents of the Stalinists in our ranks is more than probable but that is a minor matter. What is more important is to trace the influence of the Stalinist **ideas** and proposals.

Naturally these ideas and proposals find their most receptive audience in those members whose traditional positions have been farthest toward reformism; indeed, the Stalinists have in large measure merely gone back to the ideas which were once the special property of traditional reformists and near-reformists. Thus it is not at all surprising to find one of the closest parallels to the Stalinist attack emerging from the Wisconsin organization. Paul Porter's recent pamphlet, "Which Way for the Socialist Party?", published for party discussion by the State Executive Board of Wisconsin, with an introduction by the State Secretary, deserves the careful attention of every party member.

It does not require a microsrope to discover the character of the general political content of this document. An entire section is headed, "The Need for an International Peoples Front." We discover that in this country a farmer-labor party will be "a Peoples Front in effect, if not in name." We learn that the war danger now arises from "the war plans of the fascist nations." The duty of the Socialist party is to "ward off" the war danger. In doing so, however, workers' sanctions are a minor weapon (in fact, exclusive insistence on them is "in our opinion, a new outcropping of syndicalism"); chiefly we must put "pressure on the government," with such aims as: "Vigorous opposition to the maintenance of armaments **greater than needed for coast defense"** (our emphasis); "Removal from the War, Navy, and State Departments, and from the armed forces, of all pro-fascists . . .; Nationalization of munitions industries." Our peace policy "should support the peace policy of the Soviet Union; and it should demand that the American government co-operate . . . with the government of the Soviet Union and with those People's Front governments that may be established, in their efforts to prevent war through collective security." We discover that the criticisms of the People's Front in Spain and in France do "not stand up." Even the criticisms of Blum's "neutrality policy" in connection with the Spanish Civil War is pretty much unjustified. "The major difficulty with the People's Front policy, in the present period, is that it has not been applied extensively enough." "Not the disruption of the People's Fronts, but their extension into an International People's Front strong enough to overawe (!!) the Fascist International, is the urgent need today. In the U.S. it is the duty of Socialists to push **our government** in that direction." (Our emphasis.)

Even Browder must be a little breathless if he has read these last proposals.

We have seen enough to draw an irrefutable conclusion: The Porter pamphlet expresses the political line of the Communist International.

Let us go on. What will the Socialist party do about this Farmer Labor party which is to be an American expression of the People's Front? "The building of such a party is our foremost responsibility." And when it comes? If a federated party, our party will of course affiliate. But—observe—"there are, however, a number of serious objections that may be raised against the federated structure." An individual membership basis seems on the whole best—after all, it is "a question of tactics, not of principle." And, of course: "Whatever the structural relationship of the Socialist party to the farmer-labor party, Socialists must continue to function as a disciplined group. Liquidation of our party is unthinkable." So does Porter piously conclude, after just having laid the basis for the liquidation of the Socialist party into the Farmer Labor party, and the transformation of socialist activity into that of an educational league within the Farmer Labor party.

Thus, similarly, with the Socialist leagues in the unions. "There is today a widespread demand in the Socialist party for leagues of Socialists in all unions. The purpose is a sound one (we are all men of good will, in Comrade Porter's eyes): to co-ordinate the efforts of Socialists so that they may more effectively advance our cause. The tactic is, in most instances, of doubtful character for it may become self-defeating . . . As against the formation of a Socialist league is the more diplomatic and fruitful policy of mobilizing all Progressives around a program

that will be of clear and unmistakable benefit to the union."

2

On the basis of his political views, how, then, does Porter analyze the internal situation in the party, and what solution does he propose? Unfortunately for the purposes of dramatic effect, there is no surprise coming. The trouble with the party is the "isolationist trend . . . that is thoroughly harmful . . . "The comrades in this group . . . in practice . . . are anti-internationalist and anti-Socialist." The spearhead of this tendency is the Trotskyist group, but their view has spread to others. Apparently, the majority group of the Socialist Call Editorial Board has fallen under their influence. At least, the article in the issue of Jan. 16, 1937, entitled 'Party Perspectives, No. 3—The Fight Against War' illustrates this tendency at its worst." "Foremost among those who are isolating the party from the labor movement are the Trotskyists . . . " (For did not the mass workers in Wisconsin elect 10 candidates to the legislature—though somehow losing 2/3 of the party membership in the process—while the sectarian "Trotskyists" across the State line, in Minnesota, merely built up one of the most powerful and militant trade union movements in American history—somehow quadrupling the party membership meanwhile, in the months since Cleveland?) Incidentally, it should be noted that "Still another group tending toward isolation is one illustrated by Norman Thomas."

What then to do? Porter is not, of course, in a position to raise the cry for expulsion and split in quite the direct language of the "Appeal to Socialists." Nevertheless, he makes clear that this is the real meaning of his chief concrete proposal. The main danger to the party, he has shown, comes from the sectarian Trotskyists. "Their dominant concern is one of bitter hostility to the Soviet Union" (the glib manner in which hostility to Stalinism is translated into hostility to the Soviet Union should be noted). "The history of the Trotskyists affords little evidence that they can aid the Socialist party or the cause of Socialism." "True, there are some now associated, in varying degree, with the Trotskyists who may be able to reverse their trend and constructively assist in the tasks we outlined in the previous section; but this they can do only by abandoning the precepts of Trotskyism." "If they (the sectarian Trotskyists) cannot accomodate themselves to the needs of the time, then they must be required to part company with us."

This is plain enough talking. The price of remaining in the party, if Porter has his way, is to be: acceptance of his Peoples Front program. And he has already made up his mind that the greater part of the "sectarians" will not get under the line: does he not point out that only **some,** now **associated with** the "Trotskyists" have a chance of "reversing their trend." But bluntly: Expel the Trotskyists; split the party. And expel them why? Because of their ideas; because their ideas are incompatible with Porter's plans for the liquidation of the party as an independent revolutionary force. It is always amusing to notice how "democratic" in practice are all the brave Right Wing defenders of Democracy.

And Porter searches around for a formula under which to expel the Left. He has not worked out anything entirely satisfactory, but he offers one approach: "Almost none of them (the Trotskyists) were members of our party a year ago. They were members of another party, the Workers party, and entered our ranks surreptitiously during the confusion caused by the Old Guard split. We say **surreptitiously,** for no request for admission was ever submitted to a national convention . . . nor even to the N.E.C. Those locals which admitted them had no authority to do so, . . ." It thus turns out that the Trotskyists are not really members of the party at all; and all the Convention has to do to solve the problem is to recognize this. Have we heard this idea expressed before? Let us turn back to the "Appeal to Socialists." We read: "When the Trotskyites entered the Socialist party it was without the consent or understanding of the members themselves." Amter's entire article in "Appeal to Socialists" should be read alongside of Section 3, Chapter I, sub-section 4, of Porter's pamphlet.

The Massachusetts Liquidators

Porter's pamphlet is not an isolated phenomenon. We do not intend, however, to list all of its parallels in other sections of the party. There have been such documents as those issued by the "Socialist Action Committee" in Indiana, centering as usual on the slogan of "Expel the Trotskyists." This Committee turned out to be composed of Communist party members and sympathizers. Recently in Conecticut, a "Committee of Correspondence"—the name so appropriately taken over from the days of '76—has blossomed forth to save the party. Its first communication is pure Stalinism, open and undisguised. And its concrete proposal is, of course, "expel the sectarians."

But a word or two is needed on the Massachusetts group headed by Alfred Baker Lewis, Bertram Wellman, and Albert Sprague Coolidge. The political position of this group was established in a signed statement appearing in the January issue of the Massachusetts "State Organizer." The solution for the Socialist party is to be found in working "for a broad Farmer-Labor party." "To do this we need surrender none of our socialist principles, none of our socialist activities; we need only to follow sound tactics and established propaganda means in carrying them on. If we can, let us affiliate as a party. **If we cannot, let us work within the movement individually and maintain our organization now as we are, later as a Socialist League within the broader party which we shall help grow about us."** What does this mean? It means nothing more nor less than: **liquidation of the party.** An independent party organizes and leads the masses as an independent force, sustaining all the complex functions that are involved in being a political party. The Massachusetts group proposes to transform the party into a purely educational association which will be part of a "Farmer Labor party." Gomberg, in New York, who holds this same position, drops all hypocrisy, and in party meetings openly and unambiguously declares for the liquidation of the party.

Shortly after this document appeared, Hal Siegal made a hurry-up trip from Altman headquarters to Massachusetts. Subsequent to his visit, a special issue of the "State Organizer" was put out, containing a much longer statement by the Lewis-Wellman-Coolidge group. The work of a finer hand was now in evidence. The formulas were altered. "Liquidation" was declared to be, in the Porter manner, unthinkable—though naturally the political position which involves liquidation necessarily, was retained. The main fire of the new statement was concentrated—against the "sectarians." The anti-Socialist character of the "group associated with the APPEAL was brought out in paragraph after paragraph. What is wrong with the party? The sectarians, the Trotskyists. How to solve the party problems? There was no need to state it explicitly, for the "solution" follows from the whole logic of the statement: the solution of the Stalinists—the expulsion of the Left.

Observe the logic, for it is not without importance: The danger to the party comes from the sectarians; the perspective for the party is to liquidate it into a Farmer Labor movement; to realize this perspective, the party must expel the sectarians. And Porter and Lewis are consistent. To accomplish their aim—which is in cold fact, stripped of verbiage, the aim of the Stalinists: namely, the destruction of the party as an independent political force—they must expel the "sectarians," percisely because these same "sectarians" refuse to accept this aim of liquidation, and thus constitute an insurmontable obstacle to it.

The Altman Group

How significant, how very significant it is to find that in all the documents of the Stalinists, including the major opus, "Appeal to Socialists," in the Porter pamphlet, in the statements of the Massachusetts liquidators, there is not one single word of criticism of the Altman group. Not one word. The sectarians, the Trotskyists, the semi-Trotskyists, the majority of the CALL Board, Zam and Tyler, the staff in the National Office, Norman Thomas, all are chided with one or another degree of severity ("more in sorrow than in anger," as Porter remarks). But not one word of annoyance against Altman.

No one will be so naive as to imagine that this is accidental. The truth is: **the Right Wing of the party, in its present stage of development, made up of a heterogeneous brew ranging from religious pacifist to Fabians to Populists to outright Stalinists, has taken form back of the Altman group.** The Altman leadership constitutes the front line of the Right Wing.

That this should be so is required by circumstances. The party membership would not conceivably swallow open pacifism and liquidationism and Stalinism. Therefore the pacifists and liquidationists and Stalinists cannot be in the forefront of the Right Wing. The Right Wing must manufacture for itself a "left front"; and the Altman leadership is admirably suited to the purpose.

Are not the Altmanites "good left wingers"? Of course they are: just read their literature and hear them speak —they continually emphasize it. Are they not "against the Peoples Front"? Certainly they say so, time after time. Are they not "against the liquidation of the party"? No one repudiates "liquidationism" more indignantly. Are they not for a "left wing position on war"? Who could dream otherwise, in the face of their protestations?

Or so, at any rate, the Altman group appears **to the bulk of its own active membership,** as well as to a number of other party members who have not yet fully clarified to themselves the party situation.

But let us pause a while. Are we quite sure just what the Altman position is? Somehow, it has never been written down concretely. Somehow, the Altman group has never had time to commit itself in writing. **The Altman group is branded with the outstanding mark of an unprincipled clique:** the group was formed **first,** and its platform and program are to be formulated—**afterwards.** When? When, if at all, it becomes clear just what organizational combination will prove most advantageous, at which time the program can be adapted accordingly. In the statement sent out February 10, 1937, calling for the national organization of the group, we read: "A program embodying our basic theoretical stand as well as our position on the immediate issues facing the party is now under preparation and will be published shortly."

"Against the Peoples Front"? No doubt. But somehow, under the Altman administration in Local New York, members are brought up on charges for criticizing Blum or Caballero; somehow Murray Baron, oustanding Altmanite, calls those who criticize the Peoples' Front in Spain "strike breakers"; somehow Local New York finds itself entangled with the North American Committee to aid Spanish Democracy; somehow Comrade Spector is brought up on charges by an Altmanite for defending publicly the position on the persecution of the POUM adopted by the National Action Committee and published in the CALL. "Against liquidation"? Of course. But somehow Murray Gross, a signer of the statement, advocates Socialists joining the American Labor party as individuals in spite of the decision of the A.L.P. that anyone joining it must renounce membership in any other party. Somehow Gomberg, an open liquidationist, votes with the Altman group. Somehow Lash, working in the heart of the Altman group, proposes a "reorganization" of the YPSL which would destroy all its independent political life. "For a left wing position on war"? Naturally. But Local New York, last June, found itself marching in a Peace Parade of the American League against War and Fascism, and even now has a representative on some kind of committee negotiating or "coordinating" with the League. And party members publicly advocating pacifism, collective security and the rest of it are somehow never found guilty of those "violations of discipline" to which the sectarians seem so addicted.

Still, a clear political position on the key problems confronting the movement is no doubt an abstract and minor matter —hair-splitting, as Porter and Lewis call it—when the party is in a state of crisis. Perhaps we do Altman an injustice. Perhaps his group **has** a position on "the crucial question." And, in truth—if by the crucial question we mean the internal question—it has. Nor is it alone in its position: it shares its point of view with Lewis, with Porter, and with the Stalinists. Let us investigate briefly:

What is the main danger to the party? The Feb. 10th statement answers: "the unfortunate trend within the party toward sectarianism and isolation. The undersigned definitely feel that there has been a drift toward sectarianism within the party and this drift must be arrested **by immediate action."** (Our emphasis.) "We cannot allow the outlook of the SOCIALIST APPEAL to set the tone of the party." Who are the sectarians? Merely the former members of the Workers party? By no means: the Altman conclusions coincide with the conclusions of the "Appeal to Socialists": "The Zam-Tyler group . . . very much like the reactionary Old Guard, . . . fear the idea of a Labor party for they fear contact with the masses. Such contacts would destroy their pretty illusion of the 'revolutionary upsurge' of the workers. Rather than face reality, they hide their heads in the sand and continue to speak in theoretical pronouncements but doing nothing to apply these in their daily life . . ." The "entire outlook" of the Zam-Tyler group "tends toward DeLeonism and monolithism . . ." "The Zam-Tyler slate" in the city elections "was supported by the ultra-sectarian caucus of the members of the former Workers party."

Who are the friends of Altman in the party? "Another aspect of this same division is in our attitude toward other elements within the party, particularly Wisconsin. We consider these sections of the party loyal Socialists, and although we differ with them on many questions, are willing to make sacrifices to secure harmony within the party."

What "sacrifices" are you prepared to make? Porter laid down the terms of the sacrifice clearly enough: the sacrifice of revolutionary principle; and, first and foremost, the sacrifice of—the Left Wing. Let us go further

in the Altman statement: "The acid test today is the question of cooperation with the power caucus within the party formed by members of the former Workers party. We consider this group to base itself upon reactionary sectarianism and feel its ideology and general perspective to be injurious to the best welfare of the party. This group has made scant headway since its formation . . . primarily because it has stamped itself within the party as a **Communist opposition rather than as a Socialist group . . .** We have no intention of helping the party to become an anti-Communist, anti-Soviet league... Therefore, we have declared that a condition of unity (with the Zam-Tyler group) must be a refusal to make political deals with this power caucus . . ." A basic plank in the proposed 5-point program for "left wing unity" is: "2. United group without the Trotskyites." (Our emphasis.)

But does the Altman leadership draw the final conclusion of the "Appeal to Socialists"—namely, on the basis of its analysis of the party situation, expulsion of the "Trotskyites"? At first glance, apparently not. Point 4 of the "unity program" reads: "A general statement be sponsored by joint committee stressing need for unity in party. We affirm our belief in the free expression within the Socialist party of every point of view **within the limits of Socialist thought."** (Our emphasis.) Altman makes no bones about exclusion of the Trotskyists being a necessary condition for a united **group.** But what does that mean with reference to the party as a whole? This Point 4 gives the answer. Does the position of the "ultra-sectarians" come within the confines of "socialist thought." The statement proves that, in Altman's eyes, it does **not.** The ultra-sectarians are "anti-Soviet" and function as a "Communist opposition rather than as a Socialist group." Murray Baron, in his speech to the first open meeting of the Clarity group, made it quite plain: the Trotskyists now in our party, he declared, are **"outside agitators"**—this is the exact phrase. The only possible conclusion is, therefore: expel them.

This, then, is the political anatomy of the Altman group laid bare. Because of the wholly bureaucratic manner in which the leadership of the group functions, because of its lack of an openly declared program, because of its demagogic hypocrisy, it is true that the bulk of the membership of the group does not understand the true meaning of its policy, and would repudiate it if it were understood. Let the membership call its leaders to account, and drag them into the light. Eyes should be opened at least a few steps before the edge of the cliff.

The Clarity Group

The APPEAL has already defined the general character of the political position of the Clarity group (i.e., the Zam-Tyler group). We do not propose here to review in detail its history and record. In the present concrete situation in the party, the Clarity group is the major section of the **Center.** It is on record against expulsions or splits, as well as against liquidation; while at the same time it refuses unity of the Left Wing as proposed by the Appeal Association. Its policy is dictated by its ambiguous and equivocal position, trying to play both ends against each other. It is compelled to reject the thesis of the Right Wing that "the main danger is from the sectatian left" and likewise to reject the thesis of the Left that the main danger is from the splitters and liquidators of the Right. It tries to uphold the formula that "the danger is both from the Right and from the Left," that the struggle must be carried on along two fronts. Its spokesman declare publicly that they are prepared to make temporary blocs either with the Right or with the Left: that is, either with those who are trying to split the party in the interests of Popular Frontism or with those who are determined that the party shall continue forward along the revolutionary road. One of their spokesman (Trager) expresses his wish for a general bloc with the Appeal Association—in a speech to the Appeal Institute; another (Zam) rejects the idea of a **general** bloc in favor of the "either-or" formula; while in New York a number of the Clarity leaders are in almost constant negotiation with the Altman leadership (having even gone so far as to fight for a joint Convention Delegate slate with Altman, until at the last moment the attempt was abandoned).

Such are the vicissitudes of a centrist policy. Curious and lamentable results follow. A large part of the membership of the Clarity group is comprised of genuine and militant left-wingers, who are in essential agreement with every important aspect of the Appeal platform and program. But they are discovering that to maintain their ambiguous position they must constantly grant programmatic concessions. The People's Front position of the **group,** for example, omits any reference whatever to Spain—that is to say, any reference to the People's Front where it is decisive. But in the YPSL in New York, the members of the Clarity group support the same resolutions on the People's Front and Spain which were adopted by the Appeal Institute! That is: the Clarity group has two quite different positions on the People's Front and Spain—one for the YPSLs and one for the party. They are compelled to pose as a "unity group" fighting against threats of split from the Right and threats of split from the Left: though they can advance no shred of evidence to demonstrate that the Left in any way, either explicitly or implicitly, stands for split or expulsion. They are forced to say that there is a Right danger of liquidationism and a Left danger of sectarianism. But when pinned down to define where the "danger of sectarianism" is to be found, they can give no answer: Zam was asked this question at the Appeal Institute in Chicago; he could hardly have declared that the Institute represented a "sectarian" danger, with its members before him—three-fourths of them prominent activists in the trade union and unemployed movements; and finally he said that sectarians could be discovered—in Colorado and Camden, N. J.

What is the effect of the Clarity position in the party crisis? In spite of the fact that it is against a split, in spite of the fact that the bulk of its followers are genuine left-wingers or anxious to become so, the failure of the Clarity group to unite firmly with the revolutionary Left Wing necessarily weakens the struggle against the splitters and liquidators, necessarily aids Altman. How could it be otherwise? By having a group separate from the Appeal group, Zam-Tyler tend to confirm the contention of Altman and the Stalinists that the "Trotskyites" are hopeless sectarians, with whom no one can get along. By continuing conciliatory moves toward Altman and negotiations with him, Zam-Tyler make it easier for him to marshall his forces, and harder for the left to fight back **politically.** By watering down their program, Zam-Tyler weaken the resistance to the ideas of the Right Wing and of Stalinism. By calling for a simultaneous struggle against both Left and Right, Zam-Tyler disperse left-wing energies which should now be wholly concentrating on the job of saving the party for revolutionary socialism by defeating the campaign of the Right. And in the long run their policy condemns their own group to

utter disintegration. If the Right succeeds in its plans to expel the left, what then would be the fate of the Clarity group? If it remained in the Party it could do so only as the helpless captive of the Right, bound hand and foot. If the Right Wing fails—as the Left is determined it shall fail—the Clarity group will only find that the vacillating policy of its leadership has let its own right flank slip over into the camp of Altman, while its left-wingers join in the united struggle of the Left.

The Perspective of the Appeal

The point of view of the APPEAL has always been clear and unambiguous. We stand for the completion of the development of the Socialist party into the revolutionary Socialist party of the American working class, the party of militant class struggle and vigorous mass action, basing itself upon the full program of Marxism. As the most efficient and rapid instrument for achieving this goal, we have proposed and continue to propose unity of all left wing forces in the party on the foundation of the Marxist answer to the key questions now confronting the party: the People's Front, Spain, the trade union question and mass work, disciplined party activity, inner-party democracy, the internal crisis in the party. We have sought, and continue to seek, that unity through a fusing of the Clarity group, the supporters of the APPEAL, and hitherto unconnected left wingers. Up to the present the Clarity group has rejected such unity. The pressing needs of the party, however, as well as the rapid deepening of the international crisis and the approach of the new war, do not permit us meanwhile to sit passively by. The Appeal Institute held in Chicago marked an immense step forward in the forging of a united revolutionary left wing, rallying together around the Appeal program and perspective a substantial percentage of the most militant and active party members, and forecasting complete and firm left wing unity for the near future.

Right now the problem of the Convention faces us, and faces us with the threat of expulsions and splits issuing from the Right Wing. To defeat this threat, we propose the only course of action that is most effective in defeating splitters and liquidators: we propose an uncompromising political struggle against them. Splitters cannot be bought off by kind words and conciliation; such an approach only makes them more bold and ruthless. They must be defeated **politically** before the eyes of the party membership. The Left Wing does not propose to conquer them by expulsions and splits. Far from it. The Left Wing has no need to solve political problems by bureaucratic and organizational measures. It is sufficiently confident of its ideas and policies to rest its case upon the democratic decision of the membership.

A united Left Wing is the best and surest means for defeating the splitters and liquidators. If this is impossible in these next weeks, we propose and insist on full and loyal collaboration among all of those forces who are against a split and for a revolutionary party. **No** collaboration, **no** bloc, on **any** issues, with the splitters. Such collaboration, however temporary and minor, can only aid the Right Wing, can only injure the interests of the Left and of the future of the party. Specifically: the members of the Clarity group must prevent their group from entering into a bloc with the Altman group on any question whatever; collaboration with Altman is collaboration with Lewis and with Porter, and thus in the last analysis concession to the campaign of the Stalinists.

This is not the occasion for a detailed statement of Convention proposals. From a firm political line and a clear perspective these follow as practical and concrete applications. How fully the Convention will be in a position to **solve** the fundamental issue is not yet, by the nature of the case, clear. This much, however, the Convention can accomplish, and through this can guarantee the advance of the party: an orientation of the party toward mass work, above all work in the trade unions; provisions for compulsory disciplined leagues in the mass organizations; full participation of all groups in the party in the responsible direction of party work, in accordance with their relative strength, and comparative abilities and talents; solid guarantees of inner-party democracy.

There is not much time. To all those active party members who are resolved in their hearts that our party shall become the revolutionary leader of the working class, that it shall smash through the barriers of class collaboration, and defeat the plans of Stalinism for the harnessing of the workers to the war machine of imperialism, we say:

Forward with us!

For a revolutionary party of mass struggle, rooted in the unions!

Against the splitters and liquidators; against class collaboration and Popular Frontism!

For a united, disciplined, democratic party!

For the workers' revolution! For international socialism!

THE APPEAL INSTITUTE

BY ALBERT GOLDMAN

JUDGED by every standard, the Institute which met at Chicago for three days (Feb. 20-22) under the auspices of the SOCIALIST APPEAL has a significance which no revolutionary Socialist can fail to recognize. The number present, the social composition of the delegates, the important role which many of them play in class struggles throughout the country, the spirit of those attending the Institute—both as delegates and visitors—, the high level of the discussion, the character of the resolutions adopted, all just fied the feeling of everyone present that a remarkably effective and successful gathering of left wing Socialist had taken place.

And all this in spite of the fact that less than twenty days elapsed between the publication of the call for and the holding of the Institute. It must be remembered that only after all efforts to hold a united left wing conference had been exhausted was it decided by the Appeal Association of Chicago to conduct an institute. No one had in mind the calling of an Appeal Institute; it was taken for granted by practically everyone interested in the organization of the left wing forces prior to the party national convention that a united left wing conference of some kind would be held. Irreconcilable differences on the method of calling such a conference made it essential for some group to take the initiative in preventing complete disorganization of the left wing prior to and at the convention. The Chicago Appeal Association took the initiative and it must be admitted that few, if any

comrades, had great hopes for a fair attendance. The time was too short for adequate preparation; the season of the year made attendance more difficult; there were no organized groups outside of Chicago; it was too close to the national convention. Under the circumstances the presence of thirty-five delegates would have been considered a good attendance.

A few days before the Institute it was estimated by the optimists that close to seventy five delegates would attend. No one dreamed that one hundred and eight delegates would register and had it not been for comrade Abern's ab lities in handling the technical side of the Institute there would have been considerable confusion. As it was the feeding and housing of the delegates reached a high degree of efficiency and set a standard for all conferences to emulate.

Twelve states were represented at the Institute. California comrades were unable to attend but sent greetings and financial support. About seventy five of the delegates were participants in some form of mass work. The steel, automobile, railroad, electrical, trucking and rubber industies were represented; many were active in the unemployed movement. That the most revolutionary section of the Socialist party could bring together under such adverse circumstances a group of comrades of the type represented at the Institute is of great significance and certainly furnishes encouragement to those comrades who see in the left wing of the Socialist party the hope of the revolutionary movement. And most encouraging of all was the fact that the so-called "natives" as contrasted with the members of the former Workers' party, were present in substantial numbers.

As is most proper in any gathering of revolutionary Soc alists the Institute was opened by an address on the international situation, by Max Shachtman. That gave the tone to all of the sessions of the Institute in the sense that all of the problems discussed and analyzed were done so with the understanding that we are part of an international movement and that we must help build an international revolutionary force. After Shachtman's analysis of the forces at work on the international scene the writer reported on "The Road Ahead," the platform published in the December 15 issue of the APPEAL. An exceedingly heated and interesting discussion followed the report.

Clarity Group Represented

To the Institute, as observers, came comrades Herbert Zam and Frank Trager, representing the Socialist Clarity group. Since Zam and Trager furnished the elements of controversy in the Institute a vote of thanks is due them for making the Institute more interesting than it would otherwise have been. As much time was given to Zam to speak against the platform as was given the writer to report in its favor. Comrade Zam took up most of his time in his first speech with the internal situation and only after that fact was pointed out by subsequent speakers did Zam in rebuttal launch into a criticism of the Appeal platform.

Zam's criticism of the platform revolved around two alleged defects. One, that it was not sufficiently complete in that it failed to treat such fundamental questions as the dictatorship of the proletariat, the road to power; it did not give a full position on the Labor party question or on the International question. The other defect dealt with the attitude of the platform to opposing working class parties. This attitude was labelled as coming close to the theory of social-fascism. Zam did his best but he had such a diff cult position to defend that his best was hardly effective. No wonder he spent most of his time on the question of the attitude of the comrades responsible for the platform and not on the platfarm itself.

Is the platform incomplete? If it be considered as a programmatic document formulating answers to all the theoretical problems confronting the revolutionary movement it is of course incomplete. But it was not intended to be such a document. The platform itself speaks of the adoption, in the future, of such a fundamental program which will "proclaim the historical necessity of the workers' dictatorship as the only means for the conquest of power, as the only guarantor for genuine workers' democracy and the only weapon for the attainment of socialism." But this is not the purpose of the platform nor is the party or the left wing prepared to adopt a correct program on all fundamental questions. The purpose of the platform was a much more modest one: to point out the general direction in which the party should travel, to indicate the immediate porblems confronting the party and the left wing and in a general way to point to the proper solutions of these problems. The platform is a document of minimum demands, so to speak, for the purpose of rallying all of the genuine left wingers around it. As such a document it is complete in every sense of the word.

Necessarily not all questions of immediate importance were treated in the platform with the necessary detail. The problem of the People's Front, the question of Spain were left for further analysis in the spirit of the platform. And in so far as these two problems were given separate treatment they make the platform more complete and more correct. No one claimed that the platform said the last word on all the questions that it mentioned. But it did indicate an attitude to those questions and that was its purpose and no more.

Appeal Platform "Incomplete"

A great point was made by Zam and Trager about the fact that the supporters of the platform at the Cleveland convention insisted that the question of the road to power be included in the election platform whereas they did not treat that question in the Appeal platform. Such an argument is inexcusable. The election platform of the party had an altogether different purpose. In addition to pointing out to the working class the immediate problems confronting it and their solution it should have educated the workers in the most fundamental of all problems—that of the gaining of power by the workers. The APPEAL platform is a document intended for the party members and especially for the left wingers, indicating the immediate problems confronting the party. In such a document it would have been the height of scholasticism to include a dissertation on the road to power.

It is not denied that the platform does not deal with the questions of the Labor party and of the international relations of our party in an exhaustive manner. These problems were treated so sketchily with a definite purpose in mind. The framers of the platform wanted to formulate a document acceptable to all left wingers and since there are vital differences of opinion on the Labor party question and on the International question it was felt that these questions should be formulated in a way as not to exclude any left winger.

At the Institute it was clear that the majority of delegates favored a resolution on the Labor party which would oppose categorically the idea that it is the duty of Socialists to help create a reformist Labor party. But it was made clear that the resolution on the Labor party was not "mandatory," that is, that the delegates did not make the acceptance of such a resolution a condition precedent to joining the APPEAL Association. A party member can join the Appeal Association and feel absolutely free to propagate ideas with reference to a

Labor party which are contrary to the ideas formulated in the resolution so long as they are in agreement with the formulation of the Labor party question found in the APPEAL platform.

The same is true of the international question. No resolution on that question was adopted but comrade Burnham in his report stated the views of the majority when he favored the idea of a complete break with the Labor and Socialist International. In this case also the question was not treated as a mandatory proposition. So long as any comrade is willing to accept the general formulation on the International question contained in the platform it is sufficient and he is not bound by the views of the majority.

To contend that the platform is incomplete is to assert that at this particular juncture of the development of our party it is necessary to say everything on every conceivable question in a platform intended to mobilize all the left wing forces. A proposition which no Marxist interested in the development of the left wing and of the party would be guilty of. No one who knows anything about the character of the APPEAL and the comrades supporting it will make the charge that we believe in concealing any of our ideas. We shall always state them openly but that is a different thing from making the acceptance of those ideas a sine qua non for the joining of a left wing group.

Nor did the charge that the platform tended towards the idea of social-fascism because of its attitude to opposing working class parties have any greater merit than the accusation that it failed to say everything on all questions. Do we and should we consider the Stalinist party as an enemy? Of course. But we must also consider it as a party of the working class, a party to which we must constantly appeal for united fronts on specific issues. This has nothing in common with the theory of social fascism. Nor would it be correct in the slightest to consider the rank and file members of the Stalinist party as enemies. But the Stalinist party as such, representing all that is poisonous in the revolutionary movement, is an enemy of any party that will attempt to play a revolutionary role. Some may be squeamish about the use of the word 'enemy.' We shall not quarrel with them so long as they agree that a revolutionary party must have an attitude of implacable hostility to the party representing the ideas of Stalinism and that it is necessary to say so in so many words.

"Right and Left Danger"

It was during the discussion on the APPEAL platform that Zam and Trager attempted to justify the existence of the Clarity group with the contention that what the party required was a group of left wing Socialists to struggle both against the right and ultra left sectarian tendencies. Zam denied that he meant to indicate that the Appeal group is the sectarian ultra leftist group in the party. Why then should any group be organized with the purpose of fighting against sectarian tendencies? And why should the Appeal Institute be asked to come out with such a slogan? Because, according to Zam, there are indications of sectarianism in different parts of the country. Necessarily Zam had a hard time to point out any organized group with a sectarian policy and that is why it appeared absurd for him to raise the question. That there are sectarian tendencies on the part of individual comrades in the party no one cared to deny. But that these tendencies represented a danger to the party was a proposition so preposterous that no one could take it seriously. When Jack Altman and Paul Porter talk of sectarianism it is understood that they mean the revolutionary left wing but why should the Clarity group raise such a fictitious issue?

It was not difficult for the speakers on behalf of the Appeal platform to demonstrate that the only danger in the party is a danger from the right and that to fight that danger it is necessary for the revolutionary left to unite on a minimum basis. That the delegates to the Institute, at least, accepted the right danger as the only danger was made clear by the vote on the adoption of the APPEAL platform. Seventy six voted for adoption and two abstained.

The resolutions on the People's Front, on the Spanish Situation and on the Trade Union question were adopted without any differences appearing except on questions of formulation or on matters of secondary importance. (The resolutions on the first two subjects were printed in the last issue of the APPEAL. The amendments to these resolutions appear in this issue, as well as the resolution on the Trade Unions.) These three resolutions were the basic documents, together with the platform, adopted by the Institute. Basic in the sense that they were considered to be the resolutions which determined the political character of the Appeal group at the present stage of the development of the left wing of the party. It was not expressly formulated but it was clearly understood that the Appeal group would insist upon the acceptance of the basic principles contained in those resolutions for the entry of comrades into the group or for the uniting of different groups into one left wing group. This does not mean that every formulation of the resolutions must be accepted but it does mean that every basic principle enunciated in the resolutions is considered essential by the Appeal group as a basis for any left wing. Nor does it mean that membership in the Appeal Association is confined to those who think that the resolutions are correct; a party member can join the Association with the idea of changing the resolutions but he must agree to be bound by them.

Resolutions Distinguished

As was indicated above, the attitude of the Institute on the Labor party and on the International question differed from its attitude on the People's Front, the Spanish and Trade Union questions. On the Labor party a resolution was introduced (published in this issue of the APPEAL) which gave the opinion of the majority of the delegates on that question but which is not binding on any one who is or wants to become a member of the Appeal Association. No resolution was introduced on the International question but comrade Burnham's report was adopted as the basis for the formulation of a resolution by the incoming Action Committee and neither will that resolution be binding upon any member or would-be member of the Association.

Why should such a distinction be made? For the simple reason that a left wing should be built not on problems that appear to have no immediate relevancy to the issues confronting the party but on such problems upon which the party is called upon to take a definite stand at the next convention. Those of us who believe that it is not the function of Socialists to build a Labor party will continue to say so and say so in a maner which will not be misunderstood; at the same time we shall give our opponents the right to convince us that we are wrong and our opponents can be members of the group that we belong to. Everyone must however agree that it is the primary function of revolutionary Socialists to build a revolutionary party. Those of us who believe that the Socialist party should break with the Second International and proceed to take the initiative in forming a new revolutionary international will say so openly but we do not think that at the present moment it is an issue of such a character, although tremendously important,

as to justify us in building a left wing group on the basis of that issue.

Next to the discussion on the Appeal platform the most interesting feature of the Institute was the report and discussion on the internal situation. Comrade Shachtman gave the report and if there was any doubt in the mind of any one as to the sincerity of the efforts on the part of the Appeal sympathizers of New York to create a united left wing group, it was dispelled after Shachtman finished. Tracing step by step the events which led to the formation of three separate groups in New York out of the Revolutionary Socialist Educational Society—the entry of the Workers' party members into the Socialist party, their willingness to work amicably with the Militants, Altman's underhanded obstructionist tactics, the creation of the R.S.E.S., the vacillation of the Zam-Tyler group, the final splitting of the R.S.E.S—Shachtman proved conclusively that the blame for the existence of two left wing groups must be placed on the lack of a principled struggle waged by the Zam-Tyler group against the right wing represented by Altman.

Trager replied and like Zam did the best he could but he had an incorrect position to defend and the best of us are helpless in such a situation. His best argument was that the Appeal Association of Chicago evidently believed in two groups. He did not realize that at the time the Appeal Association was organized there was no Clarity group in Chicago and only those who were known sympathizers of the Appeal were invited. The members of the Appeal Association in Chicago are now ready, willing and anxious to discuss the formation of a united group on the basis of the "mandatory" resolutions passed at the Institute.

To avoid any possibility of misunderstanding in the future a statement on the internal situation was drafted and adopted by the Institute. In addition to taking a clear position on the need for unity in the party and coming out definitely against the splitting tendencies of the right wing (which intends to use Trotskyism as an excuse to expel all left wingers) the statement reiterates the desire of the Appeal group for unity of the left wing forces and asserts that, if such unity is found to be impossible of achievement, the Appeal group is most anxious to co-operate with the Clarity group to struggle for the unity of the party and for pushing the party towards a revolutionary position. (The statement appears in this issue of the APPEAL).

While not so spectacular, questions dealing with the problems of the party in mass work—A.F. of L., C.I.O., and unemployed—consumed as much time as the discussion on the internal situation. The charge that the Appeal group is composed of sectarians assumes ludicrous character in the face of the number of mass workers present at the Institute. But the Socialists who were present and who are active participants in mass work are also interested in theoretical questions. If there was ever a gathering composed of revolutionists who realized that in the revolutionary movement separation of theory from practice is fatal, it was the Appeal Institute. Not only were there reports on the work of Socialists in trade unions and unemployed groups; there were discussions organized by comrades who are active in different kinds of mass work. Not one important aspect of a revolutionary Socialist party was omitted from the various discussions.

From the Institute there emerged a national left wing. The Appeal Association was organized on a national basis. Branches of that Association are to be formed in every part of the country, based upon the positions adopted by the Institute on the questions which are considered to be the basis of a united left wing. A national action committee was elected to co-ordinate the work of all the branches and to formulate the policies of the APPEAL which was recognized as the organ of the Association.

But nothing was stressed so much as the idea that the Appeal Association does not consider itself the only left wing group in the party. It is true that the Appeal Association has taken the lead in formulating a position on the important problems confronting the party; it has spoken out forcefully on behalf of unity in the party, on behalf of democracy and freedom of discussion without which there can be no real unity. We shall disdain to answer those people who think that we are maneuvering and that we come out for democracy only because we are in the minority and that should we gain the majority we shall sing a different tune. We depend entirely on the correctness of our position on all questions —theoretical and tactical. And we intend to depend upon the correctness of our position to defeat our opponents and not upon organizational measures. Let them who can not defend their ideas because they are incorrect have recourse to expulsion.

The Appeal Institute, if it has done nothing else, has shown that there is no longer any barrier between the members of the former Workers' party and the revolutionary Socialists who have been in the party before the entry of the W.P. comrades. Out of nineteen members of the National Action Committee eleven were not members of the W.P. No one will deny the dominant role played at the Institute by the former W.P. comrades but it occurred to no one to make any distinction. In building a revolutionary left wing what counts are ideas and activity and not the past of any comrade or group of comrades.

It would be entirely wrong to claim that the problems of the party and the left wing have been solved by the Appeal Institute. Only a beginning was made; only the foundations were laid for a national left wing and upon these foundations it will be necessary to erect a solid structure in the form of a revolutionary socialist party held together by revolutionary theory and activity. To hammer out of our party a revoultionary instrument capable of leading the workers to ultimate victory is a task which will require time and patience. It is this task which the Appeal Institute has commenced in all seriousness. Basing itself upon revolutionary Marxism which necessarily includes theory and practice, firm in its insistence for unity, democracy, freedom of discussion and discipline in our party, the Appeal Association calls upon all left wing comrades to join its ranks or to co-operate with it in the work of building an effective revolutionary Socialist party.

POLITICAL ETHICS?

(Statement by Ernest Erber)

SOCIALIST CLARITY, organ of the Zam-Tyler ("Fight-Left-and-Right-Danger") group, has reprinted under my by-line an outline I wrote on the labor party question two years ago when I favored the incorrect position of having Socialists help create a reformist party.

While one may grant that it is permissible to reprint a political article without the knowledge and consent of the author, it was distinctly unethical to reprint this particular article of mine without indicating the date of its writing and without adding some note to the effect that I no longer adhere to the views expressed therein. a fact of which I am sure the editors of SOCIALIST CLARITY are fully aware.

I am however gratified to know that the comrades of the Clarity group have arrived at my position of two years ago; this promises well for the future, especially for the younger members of the group, who benefiting by the increased tempo of political life today will pass much more quickly through the labor-party state of their development. As for myself, I now hold a position on this question in common with the other comrades in the Editorial staff of the SOCIALIST APPEAL.

Resolutions Adopted at Appeal Institute

Statement Adopted on the Internal Situation

(Referred to incoming National Action Committee for elaboration)

1. Recent developments make clear that our party is threatenend with a split. The threat originates both from outside of the party in the vicious campaign of the Communists whose aim is to destroy our party as an independent force; and similarly from the inside of the party, in the increasingly bitter attacks of the right wing against the left, attacks which in many instances reach the point of calling openly for the expulsion of the left.

2. The attacks and the demands for expulsion are formally directed against the "Trotskyists" under which term the right wing and the Stalinists mean all revolutionary Socialists. They are motivated on the alleged grounds that "Trotskyists" (i.e. revolutionary Socialists) cannot be assimilated, are incorrigible "factionalists," are unwilling to do any party work, and are damaging to the interests of the party.

3. In reality the attack in this form is only a mask. The opposition from the Stalinists and the right wing to the genuine left wingers in the party flows from their opposition to the ideas and practices of revolutionary socialism. By formulating the attack as they do they are attempting to hide its true political motivation. They are trying to substitute organizational measures for a political solution of the problems confronting the party. They are in effect proposing to expel the left wing for its ideas, for the ideas of revolutionary socialism. In this way the right wing of the party, just as it has borrowed its weapons from Stalinism, is playing into the hands of the Stalinist campaign to destroy the party.

4. The Appeal group has consistently opposed a split in the party and continues to oppose a split. The Appeal group would oppose the expulsion of any comrades on the ground of the ideas which they hold. It stands for a united party; and—as an absolutely necessary condition of unity—for full democratic freedom within the party for all groups and individuals to express their ideas and to present them to the party membership. The Appeal proposes to work together with all groups and individuals having the same object of maintaining the unity of the party and assuring that inner-party democracy which is necessary to unity.

5. The surest aid to maintaining the unity of the party and to assure its growth in a revolutionary direction would be through the unification of the left wing forces into one united left wing (which means above all unity between the Appeal and Clarity groups). The Appeal group has consistently favored and worked for such unity and reiterates the position which it has held on this question. It is ready at any time to meet with the Clarity group in discussions or conferences looking toward the goal of a united left wing.

6. If, however, such unity is found to be impossible during the next period, the Appeal group is ready and willing to collaborate to the fullest extent with the Clarity group in joint efforts to protect our party against the threatened split, to maintain the unity of the party, to guarantee a healthy and democratic regime within the party, and thus to permit the party to go forward on the road of the class truggle toward the goal of workers' power of socialism.

Problems of the Trade Union Movement

1. NEW IDEAS of trade union organization and activity are now being put to the test in the fire of action. At the same time important strikes indicate a perspective of new and more intense struggles. The magnificent scope of these events may well signify a decisive turning point in American labor history.

2. It is not the first time during the period of business revival, when the rising cost of living soars above the wage level while profits mount ever more rapidly, that mass discontent has been turned toward aggressive trade union organization. But it is the first time in many years that such developments have begun to take roots in the mass production industries. On the one hand the workers are devising new and ingenious methods to build the union by spontaneous direct action. Most notable are the various kinds of stay-in strikes, which tend to promote the general idea of strikers' taking possession of the factories as a means of preventing scabbing. On the other hand, genuine unions begin to grow out of the very heart of company unionism. From both directions these efforts tend to converge into one general campaign of organization. Above all, however, stands the significant fact that the present strikes are introducing a new type of unionism, departing in many important respects from the traditionally recognized forms and methods.

3. This new type are the industrial unions embracing all the workers in a given industry regardless of craft or skill. At the outset they are distinguished from the old line craft unions by their much broader mass basis, their more distinct proletarian character, greater militant qualities and by their methods of more genuine mass action. Both formally and in actuality they constitute the beginning of a new movement built around the Committee for Industrial Organization in the field of basic industry.

4. Gigantic corporations, such as exist in these industries, occupy a dominant position within the national economic structure. Consistent antagonists to the trade unions, they have broken up attempts of organization, promoted anti-labor policies and maintain either the open shop, or failing in that, they have created company unions. This stubborn resistance, instead of abating, will grow more relentless, as a result of which the struggle for organization tends to become much more uncompromising. On the other hand, the determination of the workers to organize and their impulse to fight has not diminished in the face of these obstacles; it has increased, and the unions, in the basic industries, will likewise occupy a dominant position and play a decisive role in the class struggle. The impact of these developments cannot, in the present period, be confined within the sphere of purely trade union questions. They carry the implications of conflict with the whole of the employing class and its executive state organs, which will bear profound social consequences.

5. It is imperative that the party give the greatest and most minute attention to these perspectives. In every sense it must orient itself decisively toward trade union work. The present situation lends itself favorably for Socialist activity and for the extension of Socialist in-

fluence within the trade unions. This we should accept as our main and most important job. Any notion that this can be considered to be separate and apart from the political tasks of the party is equally as false as is the practice of trailing behind the mass movement. The party must show the way and give leadership. And only when it attains deep roots in the trade union movement can it in actuality become a party of struggle and become the revolutionary party of the American working class.

6. But the present situation is also complicated by the split between the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O. The two are heading in opposite directions and have entered upon a struggle for supremacy. The A.F. of L. official family resists all manifestations of mass organization and confines its efforts almost exclusively to the skilled crafts, while the C.I.O. shifts the center of gravity of the movement to the basic industries. In this new field mass struggle tends to become the axis of all collective bargaining; reliance on friendly collaboration with employers must therefore give way to reliance on the power evolved by the mass organizations, as a result of which the movement will tend to develop in a leftward direction. On the whole the traditional A.F. of L. basis facilitates the continuation of the stranglehold now maintained by the reactionary labor agents of capitalism, whereas the C.I.O. will afford the greatest possibility to foster genuinely progressive forces. The direction of the C.I.O. is the direction of advance for the labor movement just as the direction of the A.F. of L. leads to disintegration and decay.

Correct Approach to Unity

7. With the suspension of the C.I.O. an accomplished fact, as is now the case, the question of which of the two conflicting movements will prevail assumes the greatest importance. This question cannot and must not be subordinated to a mere abstract slogan of unity, as is being done by the Communist party. It is perfectly true that the maintenance of trade union unity offers an inestimable advantage to the workingclass. But it is also the concrete content of unity, and not unity as a mere abstraction, that is important. Unity cannot be posed as a question of the merger of the two bodies, for which a compromise basis is to be worked out mutually. It is presented at this stage under the form of a return of the C.I.O. to the A.F. of L. If, however, this return were accomplished on the terms of the A.F. of L. burocracy— namely complete capitulation on the part of the C.I.O. to the demands of the burocracy— this would involve a complete surrender of all progressive implications of the CIO. Such a surrender could only signify the destruction of the great possibilities that are now available, and drive the history of recent progressive developments into reverse. The demand for the unification of the trade union movement must, therefore, be put forward on the basis of, and only on the basis of the policies and tactics of progressive unionism in the present period. Revolutionary Socialists and militant workers generally must be prepared to maintain and carry through consistently this approach; and must resist every reactionary and capitulatory proposal which tries to masquerade under the slogan of "unity."

8. It is no accident that the Stalinist "unity" slogan coincides with the position of the New York Old Guard; rather it represents a certain identity of political lines Both make amply clear that their slogan for unity within the American Federation of Labor framework implies the policy of surrender to the control of reactionary federation leaders. Thus at the Tampa convention, one delegate, who is a prominent member of the Old Guard, as well as the delegation from the Stalinist controlled Furriers Union, voted, in the name of unity, in favor of the resolution of suspension. Likewise the Stalinist insistence that unions organized in the heavy machinery industry be not carried away from the jurisdictional claims of the Machinist Union over into some of the industrial unions, where these workers would properly belong, was clearly a vote against industrial unionism. Their influence in the Maritime Federation of the Pacific Coast and at the convention of the Federation of Teachers, served, as in similar instances, to smother clear cut support for the C.I.O., militated against the struggle for its progressive development and lent direct aid to all the reactionary tendencies in the movement.

9. Stripped of its deceptive coating, the Stalinist "unity" slogan is the particular trade union phase of the strategy to achieve an American People's Front, into which they intend to include forces outside and inside the two old parties. Thus in theory and in practice the Stalinist trade union policy proceeds entirely from this class collaboration policy, abandoning more and more the fight for economic demands, currying favor with the bureaucracy, disorienting the progressive struggle, attempting to subordinate the aims of the labor movement to the policies of bourgeoisie and maintain the status quo in the relationship of the existing class forces.

10. The conclusion that can possibly be drawn today in regard to the question of unity is that this depends essentially upon the firm establishment of the progressive direction as the dominant tendency in the movement. Once this is established, unity can become a practical question of merger and it is possible to fight for its realization on the basis of the progressive program, on the basis of an advance for the working class.

Neutrality Impermissible

11. For Socialists, neutrality in the conflict between the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O. is as impossible as neutrality in any other issue of the class truggle. The party must take its stand unequivocally on the progressive side, but this position, to be effective, must be linked with an implacable opposition to, and unrelenting struggle against the pernicious influence of class-collaborationism in general and Stalinism in particular. These two tasks go hand in hand, and in the trade union movement we shall meet the crucial test of our ability to combat this influence.

12. In taking our stand on the side of the C.I.O., we are motivated solely by considerations of the interests of the working class as a whole. Obviously, in the choice with which we are confronted, determined support of the C.I.O. and, together with this, the further development of its progressive implications, offer the greatest advantage to the working class. But this support should not remain platonic support. It needs to be carried into all spheres of active life of the movement, and it must include such tasks as winning over to the C.I.O. the independent unions such as exist in manufacturing industries and the public utilities. It should also promote the idea of inducing international unions now in the A.F. of L., such as the Brewery Workers and the Bakers Union, and others, to transform the sympathy they have already expressed into direct support of the C.I.O. It goes without saying that we should simultaneously advocate and support, wherever the possibility and necessity arises, all practical steps for amalgamation so that the C.I.O. unions may become industrial unions in fact as well as in name.

13. Support of the C.I.O. is not to be interpreted, however, as uncritical support. Neither the way in which it is at present constituted, nor its leadership is sufficient answer to the needs of the workers. No provisions exist

in its structure for collaboration and mutual influence by the affiliated unions in decisions and execution of policy, except such action as can be had through a committee of union presidents. Questions of vital interest to the rank and file may be arbitrarily decided or simply brushed aside by this committee of presidents. As a matter of fact there is the greatest danger that such a committee will become essentially a highly centralized bureaucracy the main purpose of which is to check or to crush, if possible, the genuinely progressive forces. Support of the C.I.O. must, therefore, be linked with the continued advocacy of militant class struggle policies and trade union democracy; and practical efforts must be made to extend democratic control and participation in the C.I.O. and its affiliated unions. A prime requisite in guarding against these dangers and assuring these ends is, of course, the building of a militant and progressive movement under Socialist leadership in the unions.

14. Support of the C.I.O. is not to imply in any sense whatever support of the ideological and political position of its leadership. This leadership cannot be depended upon to carry out even its own avowed aims. Among those who make up the leading committee many have a distinctly reactionary past, many promote today openly arbitrary and bureaucratic methods, and all of them, regardless of the progressive position occupied by the movement as a whole, are fully committed to the policy of class collaboration. Individually, and through the C.I.O. as an organization, they are firm supporters of the Roosevelt administration seeking at every opportunity to tie up the fate of the unions with the labor relations machinery of the capitalist state, as a result of which their role must inevitably be a continuation of the class collaboration policy in every field of activity. Nevertheless a progressive movement may develop for a time under such a leadership pressed forward by the impulse of the masses. But the further progressive development of the movement depends decisively on a continually increasing influence exerted by the revolutionary forces.

15. Thus a serious duty rests upon the party, which it must take up in earnest. The task is to extend Socialist influence in the trade unions, both in the C.I.O. and in the A.F. of L. For this purpose a clear and unambiguous Socialist trade union policy is imperative—not only a policy in general, but also a policy for every important concrete issue that arises. It should be worked out in accordance with the general slogans: for industrial unionism, for organization of the basic industries, for a class struggle policy, for trade union democracy. The purpose of the party policy must be to serve as a guide to action for the party membership and for the genuinely progressive forces as well. We should not support any notion that our members, or progressives, leave the craft unions of the A.F. of L. to which they now properly belong. On the contrary, the progressive struggle is equally necessary and important in all unions, and our support of the C.I.O. should, in the A.F. of L. craft unions, take on the form of a fight for amalgamation in addition to the fight for the general slogans stated above.

16. A Socialist policy for the trade unions will draw a clear line of distinction between ourselves and opponent parties and groups. This does not mean, however, that we exclude the united front tactic from our trade union work. A united front in all practical instances of common agreement on specific, concrete and practical issues against reactionaries, is both correct and necessary; but this must not be emasculated by no-aggression pacts or proscription of discussion and action on issues of a political character in progressive groups participated in by various political tendencies, such as is now the case in some local New York unions. In such groups it is even more necessary that the party membership make clear and fight for the party's independent position. Obviously this requires the organization and active work of Socialist Trade Union Leagues. In every union, in every workers' organization, party members must function through Socialist Leagues, obligated to carry out the party policy at all times and observing, in the strictest sense of the word, the party's discipline. Above all in our trade union work must party discipline be adhered to completely and fully.

Every party member a trade union member and an active worker in the Socialist League. This will constitute the beginning toward a genuinely progressive trade union movement in this country, and a beginning toward a revolutionary Socialist party.

Resolution on the Labor Party

(NOTE: This resolution, with some minor amendments, was referred to the incoming Action Committee for discussion and re-formulation.)

1. The workers' revolution and socialism can be achieved only through the leadership of an independent revolutionary Socialist party.

2. A mass Labor or Farmer-Labor party cannot lead to the victory of the workers and to socialism. Such a party would be necessarily reformist in character, operating within the basic framework of capitalist property relations and the capitalist state. In addition to theory, experience, especially the crucial experiences of 1914, the post-War revolutions, and the rise of Hitler to power in Germany have proved that a reformist party is unable to lead to the victory of the workers; and likewise unable to stop fascism or prevent war, since both fascism and war in the present epoch follow inevitably from the continuance of the capitalist order and can therefore be prevented only by the abolition of capitalism. Indeed, these experiences have shown us even more: that reformist parties, in the crisis, support imperialist war, suppress the proletarian revolution, and, by blocking the revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of capitalism, prepare the road for fascism.

3. The real relationship of forces in this country, the reformist character of the Roosevelt program, the nature of the labor leadership, as well as the explicit statements of the Farmer-Labor party of Minnesota, the American Labor party, and Labor's Non-Partisan League (these three constituting the major potential sources for a mass labor party) lead to the conclusion that there is little likelihood, during the coming period, of the formation of a genuine national Labor or Farmer-Labor party. Moreover, these same factors, taken together with the long populist tradition in this country, the character and symptomatic importance of the LaFollette movement, the nature of the "progressive block" in Congress and in various States, the present Peoples' Front policy of the Stalinists and the influence of the Peoples' Front ideology in many sections of the population, all those considerations show that even if a Labor party were to be formed in the near or distant future, it would be not merely generally reformist in the manner of the British Labor party, but an outright, non-class, Popular Front alignment.

4. A Labor party, since it would be a political party with a political organization and above all a political program, would appear on the political field as a rival of the revolutionary Socialist party, with its program—which is, like any reformist program, incompatible with

the Marxist program—competing with the program of the revolutionary Socialist party for the allegiance of the workers and the masses generally.

5. Though the formation of a Labor party would in a sense indicate (just as, in fact, the solid labor support of Roosevelt against Landon in a sense indicated) a progressive advance in the class-consciousness of the masses; nevertheless, the actual organization of the Labor party and the formulation of its program would represent not at all a progressive measure, but rather the effort to channelize the progressive development of the class-consciousness of the masses into safe and harmless reformist directions. That is, the formation of the Labor party, as was so strikingly demonstrated by the history of the formation of the American Labor party, would be undertaken, and undertaken only, in an effort to prevent the development of class-consciousness into the revolutionary perspective of the abolition of capitalism. Only the existence, extension, and strengthening of a revolutionary Socialist party, rooted in the mass organizations of the workers, can assure the progressive advance of the mass labor movement.

6. In the light of these considerations, it is clearly improper for Socialists to agitate for the initiation or formation of a Labor or Farmer-Labor party. Socialists must tell the truth. It is therefore their business to explain the nature of reformism, the true character of a Labor party in the present epoch, and to agitate directly for a revolutionary Socialist party as the only party capable of fulfilling the interests of the working class and of the masses generally.

7. Where a Labor or Farmer-Labor party is in existence on a local scale, or where one is formed either locally or nationally, the position of the Socialists toward it will be determined by the concrete conditions: by the attitude of the workers toward it, the nature of its class support, the state of the Socialist party itself at the given time and place, etc. Permissible tactics include: outright affiliation, where this does not involve liquidation of the revolutionary Socialist party organization; critical electoral support; direct rivalry both in parliamentary and all forms of activity. The first two tactics are in certain cases permissible, unlike the relation to any other type of party, where the Labor party, loosely organized, comprising the bulk of organized labor, and marking a stage in the development of the political experience of the masses, offers a broader forum that would otherwise be available for the propagation of the revolutionary program. In all cases, however, it is the duty of revolutionary Socialists to advance the full Marxist program as the only program answering the needs of the workers.

Amendments to the Spanish Resolution (printed in the February issue of the APPEAL) adopted by the Institute. Bold type represents changes and additions; words in parantheses represent omissions.

Section II, par. 2 should read as follows: From the very first day of the fascist uprising, arms, munitions, technicians,—every material aid—poured into the reactionary fascist **forces** from their brothers in Italy, Germany and Portugal the vasasl of British imperialism.

2. Paragraph 3 of the same section amended to read as follows: At the same time, in the name of "neutrality," parties which claim to represent the interests of the working class **used every effort to surround the Spanish proletariat with an iron blockade in order to prevent material support from reaching the Spanish workers.**

3. In section II, par. five omit the word 'four' in the first sentence.

4. Section V. par. 2, amended to read as follows: The keystone of such a program is the fact that the socialist revolution is on the order of the day in Spain at the present time. **The alternatives are clearly nothing less than Socialism or Fascism.**

5. In the eighth line of par. 7 of section V substitute the word 'subsequent' for 'second.'

6. In section six, paragraph four, insert the following after sentence two: "Indeed the policies of the Caballero wing of the Socialist party are by now indistinguishable from those of the Stalinists."

7. Delete last sentence from paragraph four, section six and in its place add: "Recent events indicate the increasingly revolutionary potentialities of POUM. It is, in fact, in response to these that a bitterly intensified drive against the POUM has been unleashed by the forces of the People's Front. The Valencia Government has called for the liquidation of the POUM; has closed the Madrid radio station of the POUM, suppressed its papers, and is now bringing its leaders to trial on charges of "treason" and "counter revolution." Similar steps are being taken against the left wing anarchists. These actions, if carried through, condemn the Spanish revolution in advance, tor destruction. The Socialist party must join in an international campaign to defend workers' democracy in Spain, and the full exercise of workers' social and political rights.

8. In the last paragraph of section six change the first sentence to read as follows: "The forces for such a party are present in Spain today in the left wing of the Socialist party, in the Socialist youth, and in the POUM."

Amendments to Resolution on People's Front Published in the Last Issue of the APPEAL.

1. In Section 13 delete the sentence beginning: "The policy of the Communist International in China . . ."

2. In Section 17, in the sentence beginning: "Chief responsibility . . ." (twelfth line from bottom of second column on page 25 of February issue of APPEAL) change phrase beginning "going to such lengths" (third line from bottom) to read as follows: " . . . going to such lengths as to demand and secure the ousting of the POUM from the Catalonian government as the price of continued material aid from the Soviet Union, and in Madrid has led to the entirely reactionary attempt to suppress the POUM by shutting down its radio and its press, and by the bringing to trial of its leaders."

3. In paragraph 18, after the sentence ending, ". . . in the coming war," (sixteenth line in first column on page 26) insert: "In Wisconsin the state organization of the Socialist party itself operating in accordance with a basically People's Front policy has entered into the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation, a coalition both in form and content resting on a People's Front foundation."

4. In paragraph 19, the sentence beginning: "It reaffirms . . ." should be changed to read as follows: "While resolved to continue under all circumstances the vigorous struggle for the preservation and extension of the concrete democratic rights of the workers, the party reaffirms . . ." (continue the sentence as is from here on). In the same sentence insert "capitalist" before the term "democracy."

RESOLUTION ADOPTED ON DEFENSE OF the POUM

The defense of the Spanish Revolution is impossible without having the international working class come to the defense of the Workers' Party of Marxist Unity (POUM) against the attacks of the Spanish Communist party and the People's Front Government.

Throughout Spain the Stalinists are conducting a campaign for the physical destruction of the only party in

Spain fighting for socialism. In Madrid the People's Front Government has already illegalized the POUM, supressed its press and radio, and arrested its leaders.

Like their "democratic" class collaborationist predecessors, the Kerenskys, the Noskes and the Scheidemanns the Stalinist carry on a pogrom against the revolutionists under the despicable pretext that they are agents of reaction—of Franco and of the German Fascists.

The campaign of terrorism against the revolutionists is intensified as the bankruptcy of the policies of the People's Front Government becomes more and more evident. The "democratic" imperialist powers, the "friends of Spanish democracy" have now joined an international people's front with Fascist Germany and Fascist Italy for sham non-intervention. All that in the name of peace and humanity.

In the Spanish army virtually reconstituted on a bourgeois basis the irresponsible and unreliable military leaders not only threaten the progress to workers' power but weaken the immediate defensive struggle of the Spanish people against the Fascist army. Even the Communist party is compelled to call for the "removal of incompetent military leaders."

Those who have been and are calling for a centralized red army under workers' control, for a workers' and peasants' govenment based on councils of workers, peasants and soldiers, and for an international campaign for working class aid to Spain, irrespective of the government policies in the various countries, are being suppressed in the name of "democracy."

The Spanish revolution is in danger! The Anarcho-Syndicalist National Confederation of Labor (CNT) has, according to report, joined with the POUM against Stalinist attacks and is now itself under attack. We must defend the democratic rights of all workers' organizations.

.We propose to the National Executive Committee of our party to do the following:

1. Call upon the Valencia Government and the Madrid Defense Junta for an immediate termination of the persecution of the POUM and the syndicalists and for the restoration of their full democratic rights.

2. As an affiliate of the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy ask that body to join with the Socialist party in protesting the suppression of the democratic rights of the POUM.

3. Re-examine the conditions under which the Debs column will operate in Spain so as to assure that it will struggle for socialism and not against the Spanish revolutionary Socialists.

4. To carry on a campaign to send material aid to the POUM as requested in a recent letter from that organization to the NEC of our party.

NATIONAL ACTION COMMITTEE OF APPEAL ASSOCIATION ELECTED AT APPEAL INSTITUTE

James Burnham, N.Y.	Albert Goldman, Ill.	Max Shachtman, N.Y.
J. P. Cannon, Calif.	Albert Glotzer, Ill.	J. Spain, N. J.
Harold Draper. N.Y.	Walter Huhn, Pa.	Arne Swabeck, N.Y.
V. R. Dunne, Minn.	E. R. McKinney. O.	Glen Trimble, Calif.
John Enestvedt, Minn.	H. Rasmussen. Ind.	R. B. Whitten, Mass.
Ernest Erber, Ill.	Carl Pemble, Minn.	B. J. Widick, Ohio
	R. Saunders, Mo.	

ALTERNATES

Martin Abern, N. Y.	J. Carter, N. Y.	J. Hall, Mass.
C. Allen, Ind.	J. Dwyer, N. Y.	California to choose
F. Bardacke, N. Y.	N. Gould, Ill.	its own.

THE FIRST TWO MOSCOW TRIALS

BY FRANCIS HEISLER
Preface by ROY E. BURT
(200 Pages)

Order Now! 25c a copy—$2.25 a dozen—$18.50 a hundred
Published by Socialist Party USA, 549 Randolph St., Chicago, Ill.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED ON THE MOSCOW TRIALS

THE MOSCOW Trials resulting in the execution of Old Bolsheviks on charges of terrorism and treason have profound significance for revolutionary Socialists and for the whole working class. Tainted juridically and reactionary politically, the effect of the trials is a criminal undermining of the confidence of the masses in the cause of the socialist revolution and in the principles which form the basis of the Soviet Union. Juridically, the complete absence of documentary evidence, the transparently clumsy fabrications of agents provocateurs, the theatrically hollow confessions of the accused and the inquisitorial methods of the GPU, when taken in conjunction with former Stalinist amalgams points to the most infamous of frame-ups .Politically the trials are a stab in the back of the working class at a time of deep international crisis, of civil war in Spain, of the approaching struggle in France, the gathering war clouds.

It has become increasingly apparent that the aim of the trials is to stamp out the traditions of Bolshevism in the Soviet Union and to destroy the independent revolutionary working class movement internationally. The Stalinist bureaucracy, admittedly basing itself on a program of national socialism, attempts to stifle the discontent of the Soviet masses with the conditions of social inequality and bureaucratic despotism. Having abandoned its faith in the principles of the revolutionary class struggle the Stalinist bureaucracy wishes to seal its alliance with the democratic bourgeoisie in the blood of the Old Bolsheviks. The trials are staged to suppress all criticism of the League of Nations, neutrality in Spain, and the treachery of the Popular Front. Because he is the greatest living survivor of the generation that made the October Revolution and indefatigably bears aloft the banner of the principles of Marxism and the World October, the principal target of the Moscow Trials is Leon Trotsky.

Today the bureaucracy hopes to strike him down and destroy his influence by the same falsifications and fabrications with which the reaction and Kerensky hounded Lenin as a German spy and with which Marx was accused as being an agent of Bismarck. Because the trials are a savage attack against the revolutionary honor and integrity of a world leader of the revolutionary movement and the whole generation of the architects of October and because they are likewise a plot to compromise the whole revolutionary socialist movement, this Socialist Appeal Institute held in Chicago records itself in favor of the setting up of an International Commission of Inquiry, a tribunal of the socialist and labor movement and its intellectual sympathizers, which will be competent to inquire into the truth of the Stalinist allegations and give Trotsky the hearing to which he is justly entitled.

SOCIALIST APPEAL

EDITORIAL BOARD

Ernest Erber - Albert Goldman - Rudolph C. Olson

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

James Burnham	John Hall	Ted Selander
James P. Cannon	Walter Huhn	Max Shachtman
Harold Draper	Paul S. McCormick	Glen Trimble
Vincent Dunne	Melos Most	George M. Whiteside
John F. Dwyer	Carl Pemble	Richard B. Whitten
	R. S. Saunders	

Business Mgr.
RUDOLPH C. OLSON

Room 719—35 S. Dearborn St. Chicago, Ill.

Subscription Rates: one dollar for 24 issues; fifty cents for twelve issues.

Bundle Orders—Five or More—Three Cents per Copy

Make all checks payable to Socialist Appeal.